MULTICULTURALISM IN CANADA

- Focus Group Summary -

FINAL REPORT

93-00366/

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 1

2.0 BACKGROUND 6

3.0 FOCUS GROUP SUMMARY 10

- 3.1 Common Canadian Values and Attitudes 10
- 3.2 Tolerance and Discrimination 12
- 3.3 Limits To Diversity 16
- 3.4 Top-of-Mind Issues Relating to Multiculturalism 19
- 3.5 Multiculturalism Policy and the Federal Government 20
- 3.6 Specific Multiculturalism Policies 24
- 3.7 Desirability of the Federal Government's Actions and Initiatives 24
- 3.8 Note on Youth Groups 26
- 3.9 Summary Comments 29
- 3.10 Focus Group Findings and Refinement of the Survey Instrument 30

APPENDIX I: Focus Group Composition
APPENDIX II: Group Recruitment
APPENDIX III: Focus Group Recruiting Questionnaire
APPENDIX IV: Scores for Paper/Pencil Test
APPENDIX V: Moderator's Guide

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Some of the most interesting findings that emerged from the focus groups related to the degree to which the recruiting procedures appeared to capture two different value sets related to the issue of multiculturalism. As noted in Appendix II, participants were recruited into different groups depending on their answer to the following question:

> "Now, I'd like you to tell me whether you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree with the following statement...people from different cultural backgrounds would be better off if they became more like Canadians rather than keeping the culture of their ancestors."

To facilitate frank discussion in the groups, those who agreed with the above statement were placed in different groups from those who disagreed with the statement. It should be noted, however, that while the division of participants on this basis led to more open discussion in the groups, the recruiting procedures did not assume a priori that public opinion could be easily bifurcated on this issue. In fact, the focus groups indicated that Canadians' opinions about multiculturalism are very complicated and subtle. Indeed, depending on the question under consideration, "Canadian conformists" (those who disagreed with the recruiting statement), and "multiculturalism supporters" (those who agreed with the recruiting statement) could share similar or different points of view.

Nonetheless, while the definitions of "conformist" and "multiculturalist" values are porous and rough hewn,they do represent somewhat different perspectives (or value sets) on the issue of multiculturalism. While a full exploration of this division must await the major quantitative survey, some related themes and hypotheses that emerged from the groups are explored below.

A. Potential for Loss of Canadian Identity

- Canadian conformists tended to believe the Canadian culture they felt comfortable with (fundamentally WASP or Quebecois) was threatened with change by multiculturalism. Change was generally perceived as negative. In addition, the pace of change (i.e. "too quick") was seen as threatening.

- Multiculturalism supporters favoured the cultural changes implied by multiculturalism as being both invigorating and appropriate for Canadian culture.

B. Pressure on Social Programs

- Canadian conformists tended to believe that the cost of basic social services would increase due to multiculturalism. Multiculturalism supporters did not believe social programs would become more expensive due to multiculturalism.

C. Discrimination a Problem

- Canadian conformists were less likely to believe that racial discrimination and ethnic prejudice were problems in Canada than multiculturalism supporters.

D. Culture Private Issue, Not Public Issue

- For Canadian conformists, preservation of cultural heritage was seen as the responsibility of individual families and voluntary multicultural organizations (i.e. the privatization of multiculturalism policy). For multiculturalism supporters the federal government was deemed to have an important leadership role to play. However, the tendency among both conformists and multiculturalists was to believe that multicultural policy and programs should be "privatized".

E. Employment Equity Issues

- Multiculturalism supporters favoured affirmative action for ethnic minorities and other forms of employment equity. Canadian conformists saw these programs as "reverse discrimination" and a threat to merit-based hiring.

F. Summary of Conformist/Multiculturalist Attitudes

i. Multiculturalism supporters

- Multiculturalism describes Canadian culture today -- we're all immigrants.
- Cultural diversity and change are enriching to Canadian culture.
- The government has an important leadership (and sometimes enforcement) role to play relative to the preservation of human rights and equity.

ii. Canadian conformists

- Canadian culture (defined as WASP or Quebecois) is under pressure to change to accommodate different races and cultures. There is a definite fear of these changes.
- Assimilationist, conformist, rationalist. It is the responsibility of those who are of cultures other than British or French to change, not the responsibility of the perceived majority to change to accommodate new cultures.
- Cultural differences are "messy" and should be minimized as much as possible.

- Multiculturalism policy pays too much attention to groups, and not enough to individuals. Ultimately, multiculturalism policy leads to some ethnic and racial groups enjoying a "special status" in Canadian society.

2.0 BACKGROUND

The Secretary of State is currently engaged in a major review of public attitudes related to the issue of multiculturalism in Canada. The review is designed to:

- o establish the current character of public attitudes related to ethnocultural diversity, racial discrimination and multiculturalism policies;

- o identify the key demographic, social and psycho-social factors which have an impact on perceptions of multiculturalism and race relations in Canada;

- o examine in detail the geographical variations of public perceptions regarding multiculturalism in Canada insofar as this is possible given sample size and other survey design constraints;

- o discern trends in attitudes over time, and by serving as a reference point, for the comparison of previous studies of public attitudes to multiculturalism and related questions, and the assessment of future changes;

- o identify the determinants of these attitudes which should be considered in the design and implementation of public education programs;

- develop more effective communications strategies in support of the government's multiculturalism policy.

Prior to carrying out the National Survey, a series of Focus Group discussions were held in order to assess and explore attitudes towards multiculturalism and to provide qualitative input into the design of the survey research instrument. The primary purpose of the focus group discussions was to explore the relationship between ethno-cultural diversity, racial discrimination, multiculturalism and nation building. In particular, the information from the focus group sessions will be useful in refining the questionnaire for the National Survey. However, the focus group results are also informative in terms of providing a preliminary understanding of the complexity of the issues under consideration.

The report presents an overview of the focus group component of the research which was conducted in February of 1991. A total of 24 focus group discussions were held, and including 18 groups selected on the basis of conformist or multiculturalist attitudes towards multiculturalism and 6 groups consisted of youths, divided into separate male and female groups. (See Appendix I)

For the attitudinal groups, attitudinal support or opposition to multiculturalism was measured in terms of agreement or disagreement with the following attitudinal statement, "People from different cultural backgrounds would be better off if they became more like

Canadians rather than keeping the culture of their ancestors." (See Appendix II) A pencil and paper test, administered in all of the groups, included 27 attitudinal items relating to multiculturalism. The results of the pencil and paper test were analyzed in terms of mean differences according to regional and attitudinal variables. The results of the self-administered pencil and paper tests are provided in Appendix IV of the report.

Participants were fully informed of the audio taping and discussion observers and assured that their individual identity would remain confidential in the reporting of the results. Each session lasted approximately two hours and was attended by 10-12 participants. Participants were reimbursed $50.00 for their attendance.

The group discussions were moderated by Angus Reid Group focus group moderators, using a discussion outline designed by the researchers in consultation with client representatives. A copy of the moderator's discussion outline is provided in Appendix V of the report. The moderator's guide was designed to elicit discussion and opinions relating to:

- Views on the values which Canadians hold in common;
- Perceptions of what it means to be a Canadian;
- Views on tolerance of ethnic diversity in Canada;
- Respondents' understanding and perceptions of the term "multiculturalism;"
- Awareness of the federal government's policy of multiculturalism;

- Reactions to the multiculturalism mission statement;

- Reactions to specific multiculturalism policies and initiatives including:

  - Department of Multiculturalism and Citizenship;
  - Canadian Race Relations Foundation;
  - Canadian Heritage Languages Institute;
  - Race Relations and Cross-cultural understanding
  - Heritage cultures and language
  - Community support and participation.

- Overall reactions to multiculturalism and views on whether multiculturalism divides or unites Canada.

This report provides a summary of the focus group discussion findings. **Detailed results of each focus group session are provided in the form of verbatim transcripts of each focus group discussion, presented in a series of separately bound appendices.**

3.0 FOCUS GROUP SUMMARY

3.1 Common Canadian Values and Attitudes

The purpose of this portion of the discussion was to guide participants into a "top-of-mind" conversation about the Canadian ethnocultural mosaic. As part of this process, participants were asked to discuss what they perceived to be shared Canadian values.

Canadians were commonly perceived in all focus groups as having a weak national identity although many respondents noted that nationalism is itself not a positive feature. One group participant in Calgary noted that our quest for a national identity is one of our most definitive characteristics: "They take it (national consciousness) for granted in other countries - in Canada the "taken for grantedness" is gone". Apathy, or the possession of a "laid back" disposition, was frequently mentioned as a Canadian trait and some participants thought that because of our benign character the meaning of Canadian was best understood legally rather than emotionally. A common thread running through the groups was the sense that the shared Canadian values resulted from a need to define ourselves as different from Americans (i.e. "We often define ourselves by comparing ourselves to Americans"). Interestingly, one respondent in Montreal thought just the opposite, and stated that Canadian identity is absent except to the extent that it is a reflection of American Culture. Also in Montreal, and related to this issue, was the observation that a recent immigrant to

the province of Quebec would be more likely to accept a Canadian identity than would be the case with a native of Quebec.

Most participants in all surveyed centres believed that understanding at least one of Canada's official languages was an important component of being Canadian, although one respondent in Montreal thought that French alone would be sufficient. Canadian Dualism, and the relationship between Canada's two founding nations, (British and French) was thought to be a uniquely Canadian feature by many participants. Canada was typically referred to as a cultural mosaic, ("not melting pot"), and as one participant in Winnipeg offered: "Taking the best qualities of all cultures will define Canada". Participants in several centres argued that the only true Canadians are the original Aboriginal inhabitants of the land. This point of view was particularly strong in Winnipeg and Vancouver.

It should also be noted that there was no single definition of the term "ethnic" expressed by participants, although in most instances it would appear that the term is reserved to reference individuals who are either visible minorities (immigrant or native born) or adult immigrants to Canada. "Ethnic" was rarely used to refer to native born Canadians that are <u>not</u> visible minorities.

3.2 Tolerance and Discrimination

This section of the discussion examined the degree to which participants accepted the general notion of tolerance as a definitive component of the Canadian identity. Specifically, participants were asked to indicate whether they believed racism and discrimination was present in Canada and, if so, where it was directed and by whom.

Participants described Canadians as generally tolerant of other cultures. In fact, one respondent in Winnipeg who claimed considerable familiarity with other countries heralded Canada as "The most tolerant country in the world". However, others expressed more cynicism. For example, a participant in Toronto described Canada as: "A tolerant - racist country". A similar response was echoed in Winnipeg where a participant suggested that Canadians were perhaps not so much tolerant as weak and shy.

Not a single participant in any of the groups suggested that racism was absent in Canada and many noted that racism is a feature of any society. A respondent in Vancouver stated: " If you take away different colours or cultures, people will pick on something else". Some participants claimed to have experienced racism first-hand or to be aware of individuals who had suffered discrimination. A participants in the Winnipeg focus groups thought that racism was generally aimed at the weakest groups in society. A broad list of perceived victims or targets of racism and other forms of discrimination was generated through the combined

efforts of all groups. Those believed to have suffered most in Canada due to racism and discrimination included:

- Aboriginal peoples
- Asian Immigrants (Hong Kong, India, Pakistan)
- Blacks
- Jews
- Francophones
- Anglophones
- Hispanics
- Women
- Disabled
- Homosexuals

Toronto was seen as the city with the highest incidence of racial and ethno-cultural intolerance. This perception was shared both by group participants inside and outside of Toronto.

As noted, while participants could offer a fairly long list of present and past targets of racial and ethno-cultural discrimination, the list varied by city. Specific targets by city included:

- Asians, Indo-Pakistanis, and Native Canadians (Vancouver)
- Indo-Pakistanis and Native Canadians (Calgary)
- Native Canadians and Filipinos (Winnipeg)
- People of colour, Indo-Pakistanis, and Asians (Toronto)
- People of colour (Montreal)
- People of colour (Halifax)
- Bulgarians (St. John)

In general, groups who were seen as least likely to have experienced discrimination were caucasian Europeans. However, it was noted in most centres that the targets of discrimination tended to change according to the current mix of recent immigrants. Simply stated, the more recent your group's arrival to Canada, the more likely it is that you will be the target of discrimination. There are three additional points to note in this regard:

- Visible minorities were viewed as targets of discrimination regardless of whether they were native born or adult immigrants.
- Non-U.K.-born Europeans who immigrated to Canada soon after the Second World War were also seen as previous targets of discrimination.

- Aboriginal Canadians were seen as targets of discrimination, particularly among participants in Western Canada.

Focus group members offered a wide variety of explanations as to the possible reasons for the continued existence of racism and discrimination in Canada. Typical responses included:

- Economic challenges such as employment and housing shortages. (Vancouver, Calgary and Toronto)
- Cliques, ghettos and a general failure to assimilate. (Calgary, Winnipeg and Toronto)
- Gangs and illegal activities. (Vancouver and Toronto)
- Perceptions of superiority among majority groups. (Winnipeg)
- Parental bias and inherited bigotry. (Montreal)
- Cultural dilution as a new culture overtakes the majority. (Montreal)
- Fear/Ignorance. (Vancouver/Toronto)
- A lack of "roots" and commitment to the province. (St. John)

3.3 Limits To Diversity

While somewhat vaguely defined, limits to multicultural tolerance were expressed in all centres and among both Canadian conformists and multiculturalism supporters. Indeed, nearly all participants had a personal limit to the amount of change they were willing to accept for the sake of multicultural tolerance. Limits included issues as diverse as (but not limited to):

- Turbans in the RCMP.
- Extended families living together.
- Protests against "home" governments.
- Affirmative action and employment equity programs.
- Observance of a holy day other than Sunday and other religious practices outside the Christian faith.

While each participant expressed some limit to their multicultural tolerance, there seemed to be only the most vague sense of where, against whom, and how these limits would be applied. In addition, some of the limits to tolerance related to expectations concerning the degree to which minority groups were expected to assimilate into Canadian culture. Those

groups that were seen to be the most willing to assimilate, were also most likely to be tolerated.

One aspect of assimilation that was seen as important for minority group members was learning either English or French. Additionally, minority group members were required by most participants to be willing to compromise some aspect of their culture in order to "fit in" to majority culture. This question of who should change, the majority or minority culture, was a clear point of disagreement among Canadian conformists and multicultural supporters. Multicultural supporters were more likely to point to the pliable, changing nature of Canadian culture as justification for believing the majority culture should change to facilitate multicultural tolerance. Conversely, Canadian conformists (including those who were themselves immigrants to Canada) believed it was the minority cultures' responsibility to try as much as possible to conform to Canadian cultural norms. As a participant noted in St. John's, "a person has to bend a little to get along in society".

Further on the question of limits to tolerance and conformity, equality between ethno-cultural groups was often expressed as the "bottom-line" by both multiculturalism supporters and Canadian conformists. Tolerance was seen as acceptable as long as it did not bestow an uneven distribution of freedoms and liberties on some groups and not on others (e.g. special status).

For example, a respondent from a Canadian conformist group in Toronto offered that limits should be invoked when: "... they want to have a right that's specific to them, because once they get that, that means that they have a power that other people don't have". Some participants thought that tolerance limits should be governed by the rule of law as it exists today, and that lawbreakers should be prosecuted regardless of whether or not their culture or religion permits a given action. In this regard, violence was often singled out as a reasonable limit to tolerance. One respondent from a multiculturalism supporter group in Halifax implied that the aboriginal uprising at Oka, Quebec in 1990 stretched the limits to tolerance beyond acceptable levels: "My support stopped right down there when they had the gunfire out, you know with the Indians blocking the road". A participant in Calgary was certain that our tolerance extends to visitors to Canada more than to actual immigrants who may be regarded as culturally or economically threatening. In most centres there was a view that some kind of reverse tolerance is expected of cultural minorities and that pre existing Canadian Customs and values (essentially Western European in nature) should be respected and adopted. The focus groups in Calgary, Toronto and Vancouver entertained lively conversations about the RCMP's policy regarding official uniforms with the consensus being that the traditional dress is more important than the values of those who wish, for cultural reasons (i.e. Sikhs and turbans), to alter it. One participant in Montreal expressed his view of Canadian tolerance by saying: "Soon it will be called the United Nations of Canada".

3.4 Top-of-Mind Issues Relating to Multiculturalism

The purpose of this section of the discussion was to formally introduce multiculturalism to the focus group and to explore the spontaneous perception of the position of the federal government on multiculturalism with a minimum of aid from the moderator. Definitions of multiculturalism were varied and were evidently the products of independent interpretation with no single definition being universally offered by the group.

Many in all groups were willing to describe Canada as a multicultural country. Female participants in a St. John's youth group said that the term "multiculturalism" triggers images of Canada itself - "I think this is what makes up Canada". Some participants in Halifax expressed images of different cultures merging together and in both Halifax and St. John's individual participants offered the term "melting pot" as a description of multiculturalism in Canada. Other participants employed a "tossed salad" metaphor to describe multiculturalism and its positive elements. "... this is a group of all sorts of different people, just like a salad has lettuce and tomatoes and radishes and onions and everything. They're all different, you get a tossed salad. Now you have a group of different people and if they work together they can achieve wonderful things." There was some consensus developed in the Montreal groups that multiculturalism was the harmonious cohabitation of many different ethnocultural groups in the same country. A single respondent in Calgary noted that the term "multicultural" was itself not a term incorporated in the popular vocabulary but was a

bureaucratic expression: "A big word the government uses". In the multiculturalism supporter group in Vancouver, one participants summarized another point of view held across a number of the groups; specifically, that although Canada consists of a variety of cultures, the ruling political and economic elite could not be described as multicultural.

3.5 Multiculturalism Policy and the Federal Government

This portion of discussion was designed to measure the degree of awareness of the federal government's multiculturalism policy and the extent to which the details of the policy were understood by the group participants. Participants were also asked whether there should be a role for the federal government in the promotion of multiculturalism in Canada.

In general, group participants knew little of the federal government's policy on multiculturalism and most of those who claimed familiarity were, upon further probing, unable to provide substantive details of the policy. Many participants in Toronto said they were aware of the policy from television, however it was clear that there was significant confusion between the multicultural programmes of the federal government and other agencies, commissions and organizations which are concerned with broader human rights issues and employment equity. There also appeared to be some similar confusion in other centres, most notably in Montreal. Several participants in Winnipeg claimed to have heard of the federal government's multicultural policy however there was some pronounced

confusion between the federal policy and local events and organizations. Many in Winnipeg pointed to "Folklorama", a local summertime festival, as an example of the federal government's multiculturalism policy. One participant in Winnipeg believed the "Spicer Commission" was part of the federal government's multicultural policy. Participants in both Toronto and Vancouver stated that even though they were not familiar with the details of the policy, they thought the policy would be appropriate because Canada was, in terms of its demography, multicultural. In the multiculturalism supporting group in Halifax, support for the government policy was offered because it was perceived as a useful developmental tool: "I think it's essential because it is such a young country. Its only one hundred and twenty four years old. It hasn't had time to develop a very deep national identity, a national culture, and at least that's what you get in other countries that have been around for a long time."

Following the top-of-mind probing about the federal government's multiculturalism policy, participants were presented with the following "mission statement" describing the actual intent of federal multicultural policy...

> "The Government of Canada recognizes the diversity of Canadians as regards race, national or ethnic origin, colour and religion as a fundamental characteristic of Canadian society and is committed to a policy of multiculturalism designed to preserve and enhance the multicultural heritage of Canadians while working to achieve the equality of all Canadians in the economic, social, cultural and political life in Canada."

While virtually all participants agreed with the intent of the statement, many also commented on its "elegant" yet "vague" and "utopian" content of the statement. A participant in Toronto called the statement "window dressing" and a Vancouver respondent thought this was simply a "motherhood statement". A Montreal participant thought that Canadian society had not yet matured to the point where the objectives contained in the statement could be realized: "This seems to be a reality of the far future, not tomorrow".

There was a widespread feeling that the government should not be involved in multiculturalism especially in Toronto and Calgary. A respondent in Toronto thought that laws and regulations would not further multiculturalism and that: "If it is worthwhile it will develop... it doesn't have to take money to develop culture". A respondent in each of Toronto and Winnipeg called the policy: "a waste of money". Participants in Vancouver and Winnipeg seemed less opposed to a government role in multiculturalism, and "education" was noted in both centres as an important function of the federal government in this area. The notion that multicultural policy was ultimately divisive was expressed clearly in Montreal, Toronto and Calgary and some thought that disputes between groups over funding would be inevitable or that some ethnocultural groups would become too powerful relative to other groups. A participant in Toronto noted that "Canadian" groups also deserve funding. Two youth group participants in Toronto thought that multiculturalism was a worthy activity and one which the government should be involved, however one cautioned that public funding for such projects should be considered a "luxury". Female youth respondents in St.

John's thought that multiculturalism policy was useful and desirable because it serves a unifying role. A similar sentiment was echoed in the female youth group in Montreal with regard to the unifying potential of the federal policy. The male youth group in St. John's was more cynical and many here thought that the government should not be involved in such "utopian" policies. In the multiculturalism supporting group in Halifax, there was wide support for a government role relative to promoting multiculturalism. One respondent referred to the government's leadership role relative to multiculturalism, in the following way: "...the government sets the tone and it should be promoted in the schools right from primary on."

While some respondents thought the statement itself was valuable (if only for its symbolism) and that it clearly reflected a Canadian reality, some thought the statement was internally contradictory. The words "preserve and enhance" were seen as particulary problematic by many participants because they created an ill defined and open-ended government mandate. Along these lines, it would be fair to conclude that while "preserving" is widely regarded as neutral and inoffensive, "enhancing" may be more than is desired by many Canadians relative to multiculturalism policy. One participant in Toronto noted that by "preserving" one runs the risk of remaining trapped in a status quo which is deserving of improvement.

3.6 Specific Multiculturalism Policies

This discussion was used to explore the acceptability of various federal multiculturalism initiatives and probed their potential contribution to building a stronger Canada. Specifically, groups were asked if they were aware and supported:

- The Canadian Race Relations Foundation;
- The Department of Multiculturalism and Citizenship;
- The Canadian Heritage Languages Institute.

Overall, group participants registered extremely low recognition levels for each of these institutions. There was some recognition of the Canadian Heritage Languages Institute in the Toronto groups, but it tended to be confused with heritage language initiatives in the local schools.

3.7 Desirability of the Federal Government's Actions and Initiatives

For each of the three federal government initiatives mentioned in Section 2.5 above, participants were provided with a brief outline of each (including general mandate and scope of operations) and asked about their desirability.

Canadian Race Relations Foundation

Most participants in all centres agreed that this could be an important foundation. One participant in Toronto thought it was attractive because it served all Canadians rather than "special" groups. A Winnipeg respondent thought the Foundation was redundant. However, education (the perceived mandate of the Foundation) was mentioned as a being superior to legislation in race relations and thus won the support of some participants in Toronto and Calgary. A Toronto respondent thought hat the foundation should work with police forces to encourage racial tolerance, while a participant in Winnipeg suggested that the foundation should operate a telephone crisis line to address racial problems. Groups were divided over the degree to which the government should fund the foundation and some were concerned about the financial waste endemic to bureaucracies. Many participants in a different centres expressed the view that the elimination of racism was not the task of the government but should rather be handled on a community or one-on-one level.

Canadian Heritage Languages Institute

A single respondent in Montreal expressed the concern that the Institute's mandate contravened Quebec's language laws but expressed approval otherwise. A Winnipeg respondent thought this was "A great way to promote cultural tolerance between groups".

There was a general feeling that although languages are an integral feature of citizenship, the preservation of non-official languages may ultimately inspire greater cultural divisions.

Respondents in Toronto, Winnipeg and Calgary also expressed the view that, ultimately, the responsibility for preserving heritage languages resides at the family, or at most, at the community level. Some participants in Toronto suggested that only the English and French languages should be promoted.

Finally, it should be noted that many participants were concerned with the allocation of public funds to any of the above organizations and private sources of funding (eg. multicultural associations, families, etc.) were generally preferred. Some concern was expressed that funding be as widely distributed as possible and not specifically earmarked for designated groups.

3.8 Note on Youth Groups

In general, attitudes in the youth groups tended to be closer to those of the "multiculturalism supporters" than to the "Canadian conformists" represented in the adult groups. As such, youth participants expressed the following opinions:

- They supported multiculturalism policy that focused on promoting racial tolerance;

- The French participants in Montreal indicated they were sometimes the targets of prejudice on the part of Anglophones;

- They recognized that prejudice/racism were problems in Canadian society, but mostly they considered it a problem of the older generations. Exposure to different ethno-cultural groups in the school system appeared to breed a greater sense of tolerance than witnessed in several of the adult groups.

- Ethnic tolerance was perceived as an important aspect of Canadian identity.

While youth participants tended, on the whole, to be tolerant of multicultural diversity, some "conformist" attitudes were expressed on selected issues:

- Participants would put some restrictions on multicultural programming. There was some concern that disproportionate funding for some groups could lead "special status" which would ultimately be a divisive force in Canadian society.

- Heritage language programs were deemed acceptable if they met two conditions:

  - Classes should be open to all Canadians;
  - There is an obligation for residents of Canada to learn one of the official languages.

- Ethno-cultural tolerance, as with the adult groups, tended to break down under certain circumstances. However, the discussions among youth participants were unique in that they tended to focus disproportionately on the issues of courtship and dating. Specific circumstances under which tolerance appeared to break down included:

  - Males treating women according to their ancestral values (seen as traditional), rather than those of the mainstream culture (seen as more progressive);

  - A visible minority male pursuing a non-visible minority female. This was seen as potentially contrary to the desires of most parents; however, it was seen as generally acceptable by the youths themselves.

Finally, very few youth participants were either knowledgable about or familiar with multiculturalism policy. Indeed, the youth groups were among the least knowledgable of all groups on multiculturalism policy.

3.9 Summary Comments

Participants were asked to conclude their discussion by offering a final opinion on the desirability of multiculturalism in general. Group members were also asked to offer a singular item of (hypothetical) advice to the Minister Responsible for Multiculturalism.

While a majority of respondents in each group expressed some support for multiculturalism, this support was "soft" in the sense that multiculturalism was seen to be more appealing in theory than in practice. Some participants commented on the difficulty of commenting on such a multi-faceted issue and noted that the subject was very confusing. Overall, focus group participants regarded themselves as tolerant of different cultures, however this sentiment was not without limits and qualifications. Support for government programs and initiatives is stronger for an anti-discrimination initiatives than for programs designed to preserve and enhance cultural or linguistic heritage.

By far, the most frequent item of advice offered by group respondents to the minister was education. Here the sentiment was overwhelming that social problems associated with culture and race could best be addressed by lessening our fears of others through information and understanding. Many respondents thought that money spent by the Minister for education in this area would be well allocated. Many thought that informing the public about multicultural issues was important.

Some respondents thought that the Minister should stress our basic equality rather than our differences and emphasise individual rather than group rights. Similarly, some said that the Minister's role should be to promote interaction among groups. The view was also expressed that the Minister should operate within more clearly defined guidelines and that the mission statement should be less vague. There was a also a consensus that the government should not be spending a great deal of money on multiculturalism in the light of other pressing social and economic needs. A few respondents thought that the Ministry was itself unnecessary or counterproductive and should therefore be terminated.

Participants warned the minister to be on guard for duplication and redundancy between this department and other public and private offices. Several respondents, notably in Montreal, thought the Minister should be more concerned with the immigration process and that only those from culturally desirable groups be permitted to immigrate. "I wonder or would ask that if a immigrant comes to Quebec, if they shouldn't have a study to see if they are interested in...in Quebec or they want to go to another province".

3.10 Focus Group Findings and Refinement of the Survey Instrument

As noted earlier, a principle reason for conducting the focus groups was to provide further refinement of the proposed national survey instrument. To this end, the source for most of the content of both the focus group moderators guide, and the paper/pencil test was a draft

of the proposed questionnaire. The focus group findings suggest the following about the current content of the national survey instrument:

- Opinions related to multicultural issues are much deeper than simple agreement or disagreement with the content of federal multiculturalism policy. Therefore, there is a need to probe the fundamental values and beliefs driving attitudes related to multiculturalism.

- The survey instrument should assume little public knowledge of the content of the federal government's multiculturalism policy. It is therefore suggested that questions exploring multiculturalism policy focus on assumptions, generic preferences, and perceived needs rather than on support or opposition to the current menu of federal programs.

- There is a need to clarify the acceptable parameters of federal government involvement in multicultural issues. As was noted in the focus group findings, several group participants suggested the preservation and enhancement of minority cultures in Canada should be the responsibility of individuals, families and private ethno-cultural organizations, not the federal government.

- There is a need to explore the relationship between multiculturalism policy and national unity. There was disagreement among group participants (mostly along conformist/multiculturalist lines) as to what impact multiculturalism policy had on national unity.

- As indicated by the results of the paper/pencil test, some of the scaler items proposed to test and track attitudes related to multicultural issues discriminate better than others. Given the need to trim the proposed questionnaire to meet budgetary requirements, these results should be taken into consideration when deciding which scaler items will be included in the final survey instrument.

- There is clearly much confusion about the terminology used to describe multicultural issues. Terms like "immigrant", "ethnic", "race", "colour", and "minority" for which the Department assumes discrete and specific definitions, are viewed by the public as almost synonymous. This suggests the need for investigate acceptable terminology in the national survey to assist in the development of effective Departmental communications.

- Previous surveys on multicultural issues have focused mostly on majority culture acceptance of various ethno-cultural groups. Given the results of the focus groups, this investigation should be further refined by exploring differences and similarities

between the tolerance and acceptance afforded immigrants and native-born members of major and minor ethno-cultural groups.

- While previous versions of the questionnaire used the term "East Indian" to probe the acceptance of this particular group, the focus group findings suggest that "Sikh" or "Indo-Pakistani" are more appropriate terms for the general public.

- The convergence of and conflict between the values and beliefs of various ethno-cultural groups and those of the majority culture constitutes one of the most significant areas of public concern relative to multicultural issues. Simply stated, the question is..."who should change to tolerate whom", the majority culture or the various minority cultures? This should be a significant area of inquiry in the national survey.

- There is much public concern about the "limits" to multicultural tolerance. Even among those described in the focus group report as "multiculturalists" there is a limit to the degree of majority culture change they are willing to tolerate. This issue has been virtually ignored in previous drafts of the questionnaire.

APPENDIX I

-Focus Group Composition-

FOCUS GROUP COMPOSITION

	Attitudinal Supporters	Attitudinal Opponents	Youth Males	Youth Females
Halifax	One Group	One Group		
St. John's	One Group	One Group	One Group	One Group
Montreal	Two Groups	Two Groups	One Group	One Group
Toronto	Two Groups	Two Groups	One Group	One Group
Winnipeg	One Group	One Group		
Calgary	One Group	One Group		
Vancouver	One Group	One Group		

Grp	Location	Part.	Group Type	Age			Sex		Birthplace	
				20-39	40-54	55+	Male	Female	Can, US, UK	Other
1.	Vancouver	11	Can. Conformist	2	5	4	5	6	8	3
2.	Vancouver	11	Pro-multicultural	6	1	4	7	4	6	5
3.	Winnipeg	11	Can. Conformist	3	5	3	5	6	7	4
4.	Winnipeg	9	Pro-multicultural	4	3	2	5	4	4	5
5.	Calgary	12	Can. Conformist	4	4	4	6	6	6	6
6.	Calgary	11	Pro-multicultural	3	3	5	6	5	6	5
7.	Toronto	14	Can. Conformist	5	3	6	8	6	10	4
8.	Toronto	14	Pro-multicultural	7	3	4	7	7	8	6
9.	Toronto	14	Can. Conformist	6	4	4	8	6	10	4
10.	Toronto	13	Pro-multicultural	6	5	2	4	9	8	5
11.	Toronto	14	Youth Female	14	0	0	0	14	6	8
12.	Toronto	11	Youth Male	11	0	0	11	0	5	6
13.	Montreal	10	Can. Conformist	3	4	3	5	5	6	4
14.	Montreal	11	Pro-multicultural	4	4	3	5	6	6	5

Grp	Location	Part.	Group Type	Age			Sex		Birthplace	
				20-39	40-54	55+	Male	Female	Can, US, UK	Other
15.	Montreal	10	Can. Conformist	3	4	3	5	5	5	5
16.	Montreal	12	Pro-multicultural	4	4	4	6	6	6	6
17.	Montreal	14	Youth Female	14	0	0	0	14	8	6
18.	Montreal	11	Youth Male	11	0	0	11	0	6	5
19.	Halifax	10	Can. Conformist	2	4	4	4	6	4	6
20.	Halifax	9	Pro-multicultural	3	3	3	4	5	4	5
21.	St. Johns	11	Can. Conformist	4	3	4	4	6	4	5
22.	St. Johns	12	Pro-multicultural	4	4	4	6	6	6	6
23.	St. Johns	14	Youth Female	14	0	0	0	14	7	7
24.	St. Johns	10	Youth Male	10	0	0	10	0	5	5

APPENDIX II

-Group Recruitment-

GROUP RECRUITMENT

Participants were screened to reflect a balanced representation by age and sex. In addition, the groups were designed to include representation both from individuals born in and outside of Canada, the United States and the United Kingdom. The focus group recruiting also included a quota system for equal representation among those who have lived in Canada less than 10 years, between 11 and 30 years and (for attitudinal groups), those who have lived in Canada longer than 30 years. The screening procedure excluded anyone working in the area of advertising, marketing or public relations as well as anyone who may have previously participated in a related focus group discussion.

As noted previously, participants were also screened into different groups according to their response to the following question...

> "Now, I'd like you to tell me whether you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or, strongly disagree with the following statement...people from different cultural backgrounds would be better off if they became more like Canadians rather than keeping the culture of their ancestors."

Finally, the screening process was designed to include only those individuals who would potentially make a positive contribution to the group discussion. All potential group participants were screened for a minimum degree of awareness of current and public affairs issues by indicating that they are the type of individual who read the newspaper on a regular

basis. The recruiting was designed to include individuals who expressed agreement (a score of 5-7 on a 7 point scale) with at least 2 of the following three self-identification items:

I don't mind sharing my opinion even if it differs from the opinions of people around me.

I would rather participate in than watch most activities.

I make friends easily and feel comfortable in new social situations.

APPENDIX III

-Focus Group Recruiting Questionnaire-

DRAFT MULTICULTURALISM
FOCUS GROUP RECRUIT
JANUARY 1991

Hello, my name is _____ and I'm calling from the Angus Reid Group. We're a professional public opinion research firm that gathers opinions from people to help in the development of new programs and policies.

From time to time we get opinions by sitting down and talking with a group of people. We are having one of these discussion sessions and are calling to see if someone in your household can participate. These sessions take about two hours and those who qualify and attend will receive $50.00 as a token of our appreciation. I would like to ask you a few questions to see if you qualify to attend.

1. **First of all, do you or does anyone in your household work, or have ever worked, in the following areas?**

An advertising agency	1	**IF YES TO ANY THANK AND TERMINATE**
A market research company	2	
Radio/television or newspaper	3	
In public relations	4	
International Banking	6	
Teaching economics and business	7	

2. Into what age category do you fall?

Under 25	1	-> **ASK FOR SOMEONE 25 OR OVER, REPEAT INTRO, IF NO ONE, THANK AND TERMINATE**
25-39	2	-> **WATCH QUOTAS**
40-54	3	
55 or over	4	

3. **SEX: (DO NOT ASK)**

Male	1	-> **WATCH QUOTAS**
Female	2	-> **WATCH QUOTAS**

4. **What is your occupation?**

WATCH QUOTAS - WHITE AND BLUE COLLAR

5. **Have you attended a focus group in the past six months?**

Yes	1	-> **THANK AND TERMINATE**
No	2	-> **PROCEED**

6a) **Where you born in Canada, the United States, or the United Kingdom?**

Yes ..... 1 -> SKIP TO Q7
No ..... 2 -> GO TO Q6b, 6c); WATCH QUOTAS

6b) **Which country were you born in?**

(SPECIFY) _____

6c) **How long have you lived in Canada?**

Less than 10 years 1
Between 11-30 years ..... 2 -> **WATCH QUOTAS**
Longer than 30 years 3

7. Now I would like to ask you a few questions about your attitudes and values. I am going to read you some statements describing different approaches to life, and I would like you to tell me how much you agree or disagree with that statement on a 7 point scale, where 1 means you "disagree totally" and 7 means you "agree completely". You can, of course, choose any number between 1 and 7 depending upon how much you agree or disagree with the statements. **(NOTE TO INTERVIEWERS: PLEASE RECRUIT ONLY THOSE PEOPLE WHO ANSWER A "5" OR MORE TO "A" AND AT LEAST TWO OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS - OTHERWISE THANK AND TERMINATE AFTER THIS QUESTION)**

		Disagree						Agree
a)	I am the type of person who reads the newspaper on a regular basis	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b)	I don't mind stating my opinion even if it differs from the opinions of people around me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c)	I would rather participate in than watch most activities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d)	I make friends easily and feel comfortable in new social situations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

8. **Now, I'd like you to tell me whether you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or, strongly disagree with the following statement...people from different cultural backgrounds would be better off if they became more like Canadians rather than keeping the culture of their ancestors.**

Strongly agree ..... 1]-> WATCH QUOTAS
Somewhat agree ... 2]
Somewhat disagree . 3]-> WATCH QUOTAS
Strongly disagree .. 4]

The session will be held:

Toronto: February 11, 1991
1. Strongly/somewhat agree to Q8 ..... 6:00 p.m.
2. Somewhat/strongly disagree to Q8 ..... 8:00 p.m.

Toronto: February 12, 1991
3. Strongly/somewhat agree to Q8 ..... 6:00 p.m.
4. Somewhat/strongly disagree to Q8 ..... 8:00 p.m.

The group will be held at the Angus Reid Group office at 1300 - 160 Bloor Street East.

Can you attend?

Someone from our office will be calling you back to confirm these arrangements. Could I please have your name and phone number where we can reach you during the evening and during the day?

NAME: _____

ADDRESS: _____

DAYTIME PHONE: _____

EVENING PHONE: _____

THANK-YOU VERY MUCH!!!

RECRUITED BY: _____

CONFIRMED BY: _____

8. **Now, I'd like you to tell me whether you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or, strongly disagree with the following statement...people from different cultural backgrounds would be better off if they became more like Canadians rather than keeping the culture of their ancestors.**

Strongly agree ..... 1 -> WATCH QUOTAS
Somewhat agree ... 2
Somewhat disagree . 3 -> WATCH QUOTAS
Strongly disagree .. 4

The session will be held:

Halifax: February 15, 1991
9. Strongly/somewhat agree to Q8 ..... 6:00 p.m.
10. Somewhat/strongly disagree to Q8 ..... 8:00 p.m.

The group will be held at the Angus Reid Group office at

Can you attend?

Someone from our office will be calling you back to confirm these arrangements. Could I please have your name and phone number where we can reach you during the evening and during the day?

NAME: _____

ADDRESS: _____

DAYTIME PHONE: _____

EVENING PHONE: _____

THANK-YOU VERY MUCH!!!

RECRUITED BY: _____

CONFIRMED BY: _____

8. **Now, I'd like you to tell me whether you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or, strongly disagree with the following statement...people from different cultural backgrounds would be better off if they became more like Canadians rather than keeping the culture of their ancestors.**

Strongly agree ..... 1 -> WATCH QUOTAS
Somewhat agree ... 2
Somewhat disagree . 3 -> WATCH QUOTAS
Strongly disagree .. 4

The session will be held:

Montreal: February 13, 1991
5. Strongly/somewhat agree to Q8 ..... 6:00 p.m.
6. Somewhat/strongly disagree to Q8 ..... 8:00 p.m.

The group will be held at COGEM, 2nd floor on 1420 Sherbrooke.

Montreal: February 14, 1991
7. Strongly/somewhat agree to Q8 ..... 6:00 p.m.
8. Somewhat/strongly disagree to Q8 ..... 8:00 p.m.

The group will be held at the Angus Reid Group office at Bureau 405, 1440 rue Ste. Catherine Ouest.

Can you attend?

Someone from our office will be calling you back to confirm these arrangements. Could I please have your name and phone number where we can reach you during the evening and during the day?

NAME: _____

ADDRESS: _____

DAYTIME PHONE: _____

EVENING PHONE: _____

THANK-YOU VERY MUCH!!!

RECRUITED BY: _____

CONFIRMED BY: _____

8. **Now, I'd like you to tell me whether you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or, strongly disagree with the following statement...people from different cultural backgrounds would be better off if they became more like Canadians rather than keeping the culture of their ancestors.**

Strongly agree ..... 1 -> WATCH QUOTAS
Somewhat agree ... 2
Somewhat disagree . 3 -> WATCH QUOTAS
Strongly disagree .. 4

The session will be held:

Winnipeg: February 18, 1991
11. Strongly/somewhat agree to Q8 ..... 6:00 p.m.
12. Somewhat/strongly disagree to Q8 ..... 8:00 p.m.

The group will be held at the Angus Reid Group office at Suite 1900, 155 Carlton Street.

Can you attend?

Someone from our office will be calling you back to confirm these arrangements. Could I please have your name and phone number where we can reach you during the evening and during the day?

NAME: _____

ADDRESS: _____

DAYTIME PHONE: _____

EVENING PHONE: _____

THANK-YOU VERY MUCH!!!

RECRUITED BY: _____

CONFIRMED BY: _____

8. **Now, I'd like you to tell me whether you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or, strongly disagree with the following statement...people from different cultural backgrounds would be better off if they became more like Canadians rather than keeping the culture of their ancestors.**

Strongly agree ..... 1 -> WATCH QUOTAS
Somewhat agree ... 2
Somewhat disagree . 3 -> WATCH QUOTAS
Strongly disagree .. 4

The session will be held:

Calgary: February 19, 1991
13. Strongly/somewhat agree to Q8 ..... 6:00 p.m.
14. Somewhat/strongly disagree to Q8 ..... 8:00 p.m.

The group will be held at the Angus Reid Group office at Suite 670, 140 4th Avenue South West.

Can you attend?

Someone from our office will be calling you back to confirm these arrangements. Could I please have your name and phone number where we can reach you during the evening and during the day?

NAME: _____

ADDRESS: _____

DAYTIME PHONE: _____

EVENING PHONE: _____

THANK-YOU VERY MUCH!!!

RECRUITED BY: _____

CONFIRMED BY: _____

8. **Now, I'd like you to tell me whether you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or, strongly disagree with the following statement...people from different cultural backgrounds would be better off if they became more like Canadians rather than keeping the culture of their ancestors.**

Strongly agree ..... 1 -> WATCH QUOTAS
Somewhat agree ... 2
Somewhat disagree . 3 -> WATCH QUOTAS
Strongly disagree .. 4

The session will be held:

Vancouver: February 20, 1991
15. Strongly/somewhat agree to Q8 ..... 6:00 p.m.
16. Somewhat/strongly disagree to Q8 ..... 8:00 p.m.

The group will be held at the Angus Reid Group office at Suite 1600, 355 Burrard Street.

Can you attend?

Someone from our office will be calling you back to confirm these arrangements. Could I please have your name and phone number where we can reach you during the evening and during the day?

NAME: _____

ADDRESS: _____

DAYTIME PHONE: _____

EVENING PHONE: _____

THANK-YOU VERY MUCH!!!

RECRUITED BY: _____

CONFIRMED BY: _____

APPENDIX IV

-Scores for Paper/Pencil Test-

Paper/Pencil Test

Listed below are some statements about a number of different issues. Please indicate how you feel about each statement, on a scale of "1" to "7", where 1 means you Disagree Totally, and 7 means you Agree Totally.

1. *People can feel secure when they are with others of different backgrounds.*

1 . . . 2 . . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . . 7	
Disagree Totally	*Agree Totally*

2. *There is no reason to worry about the survival of one's own ethno-cultural group.*

1 . . . 2 . . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . . 7	
Disagree Totally	*Agree Totally*

3. *Canadian children growing up surrounded by people of different ethno-cultural backgrounds will be left without a solid cultural base.*

1 . . . 2 . . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . . 7	
Disagree Totally	*Agree Totally*

4. *If more immigrants from various backgrounds came to Canada, then Canadians would lose their identity.*

1 . . . 2 . . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . . 7	
Disagree Totally	*Agree Totally*

5. *Having groups of different ethno-cultural backgrounds in Canada gives us an important advantage in international trade.*

1 . . . 2 . . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . . 7	
Disagree Totally	*Agree Totally*

6. *Welfare costs are higher because there are so many different ethno-cultural groups in Canada.*

1 . . . 2 . . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . . 7
Disagree Totally — *Agree Totally*

7. *It is best for Canada if all people who come to this country forget their cultural background as soon as possible.*

1 . . . 2 . . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . . 7
Disagree Totally — *Agree Totally*

8. *A society that has a variety of ethno-cultural groups is more able to tackle new problems as they occur.*

1 . . . 2 . . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . . 7
Disagree Totally — *Agree Totally*

9. *Canada will be a better place when we have full and equal partnership among all groups making up Canadian society.*

1 . . . 2 . . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . . 7
Disagree Totally — *Agree Totally*

10. *The unity of this country is weakened by Canadians of different origins sticking to their old ways.*

1 . . . 2 . . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . . 7
Disagree Totally — *Agree Totally*

11. *Canadians should do more to learn about the customs and heritage of ethno-cultural groups in this country.*

1 . . . 2 . . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . . 7
Disagree Totally — *Agree Totally*

12. *If Canadians of different origins want to keep their own culture, they should keep it to themselves, and not bother other people in this country.*

1 . . . 2 . . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . . 7
Disagree Totally — Agree Totally

13. *Foreigners are all right in their place, but they carry it too far when they get too familiar with us.*

1 . . . 2 . . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . . 7
Disagree Totally — Agree Totally

14. *The worst danger to real Canadianism during the last 50 years has come from foreign ideas and agitators.*

1 . . . 2 . . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . . 7
Disagree Totally — Agree Totally

15. *People who do not believe that we have the best kind of government in the world should be made to leave the country.*

1 . . . 2 . . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . . 7
Disagree Totally — Agree Totally

16. *It is a bad idea for people of different races to marry one another.*

1 . . . 2 . . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . . 7
Disagree Totally — Agree Totally

17. *Discrimination against non-whites is a problem in Canada.*

1 . . . 2 . . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . . 7
Disagree Totally — Agree Totally

18. *It is more difficult for non-whites to be successful in Canadian society than it is for other groups.*

1 . . . 2 . . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . . 7
Disagree Totally — *Agree Totally*

19. *Everyone should have an equal chance and an equal say in most things.*

1 . . . 2 . . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . . 7
Disagree Totally — *Agree Totally*

20. *Anyone who is willing and able to work hard has a good chance of succeeding.*

1 . . . 2 . . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . . 7
Disagree Totally — *Agree Totally*

21. *We need strong laws that guarantee equal job opportunities for non-whites and other minorities.*

1 . . . 2 . . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . . 7
Disagree Totally — *Agree Totally*

22. *It is alright for a social club to ban certain minorities from membership.*

1 . . . 2 . . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . . 7
Disagree Totally — *Agree Totally*

23. *If employers want to hire only certain groups of people, that's their business.*

1 . . . 2 . . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . . 7
Disagree Totally — *Agree Totally*

24. *Employers should set aside a certain number of places to hire qualified non-whites and other minorities.*

1 . . . 2 . . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . . 7
Disagree Totally — *Agree Totally*

25. *Government should refuse to give contracts to companies that do not have a fair proportion of racial and ethno-cultural minorities.*

1 . . . 2 . . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . . 7
Disagree Totally — *Agree Totally*

26. *The government should set an example and hire more people from ethnic minorities.*

1 . . . 2 . . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . . 7
Disagree Totally — *Agree Totally*

27. *People should make it on their own, and not blame their ethno-cultural or racial background for their problems.*

1 . . . 2 . . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . . 7
Disagree Totally — *Agree Totally*

TEST PAPIER/CRAYON

Vous trouverez ci-dessous des énoncés sur différents sujets. Veuillez indiquer ce que vous pensez de chacun, en vous basant sur une échelle de "1" à "7", où 1 veut dire que vous Entièrement en désaccord, et 7 veut dire que vous êtes Entièrement d'accord.

1. Les gens peuvent se sentir en sécurité lorsqu'ils sont avec d'autres personnes d'origines différentes.

1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . 7
Entièrement en désaccord — Entièrement d'accord

2. Il n'y a pas de raison de s'inquiéter de la survie de son propre groupe ethno-culturel.

1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . 7
Entièrement en désaccord — Entièrement d'accord

3. Les enfants canadiens qui grandissent entourés de gens de différentes origines ethno-culturelles seront laissés sans base culturelle solide.

1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . 7
Entièrement en désaccord — Entièrement d'accord

4. Si plus d'immigrants d'origines variées venaient au Canada, les Canadiens perdraient alors leur identité.

1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . 7
Entièrement en désaccord — Entièrement d'accord

5. Avoir des groupes d'origines ethno-culturelles différentes au Canada nous donne un avantage important pour le commerce international.

1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . 7
Entièrement en désaccord — Entièrement d'accord

6. Les coûts de bien-être sont plus élevés parce qu'il y a tellement de groupes ethno-culturels différents au Canada.

1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . 7
Entièrement en désaccord — Entièrement d'accord

7. Il est plus avantageux pour le Canada si tous les gens qui viennent dans ce pays oublient leurs origines culturelles aussi tôt que possible.

1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . 7
Entièrement en désaccord — Entièrement d'accord

8. Une société qui comporte une variété de groupes ethno-culturels est plus apte à s'attaquer aux nouveaux problèmes lorsqu'ils se produisent.

1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . 7
Entièrement en désaccord — Entièrement d'accord

9. Le Canada sera un meilleur endroit lorsque nous aurons une association totale et égalitaire entre tous les groupes qui composent la société canadienne.

1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . 7
Entièrement en désaccord — Entièrement d'accord

10. L'unité de ce pays est affaiblie par les Canadiens de différentes origines qui s'attachent à leurs anciennes coutumes.

1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . 7
Entièrement en désaccord — Entièrement d'accord

11. Les Canadiens devraient faire plus d'efforts pour connaître les coutumes et l'héritage des groupes ethno-culturels dans ce pays.

1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . 7
Entièrement en désaccord — Entièrement d'accord

12. Si les Canadiens d'origines différentes veulent garder leur propre culture, ils devraient la garder pour eux-mêmes, et ne pas déranger les autres gens de ce pays.

1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . 7
Entièrement en désaccord — Entièrement d'accord

13. Les étrangers sont bien à leur place, mais ils exagèrent lorsqu'ils deviennent trop familiers avec nous.

1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . 7
Entièrement en désaccord — Entièrement d'accord

14. Le pire danger pour le Canada au cours des 50 dernières années est venu des idées et des agitateurs étrangers.

1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . 7
Entièrement en désaccord — Entièrement d'accord

15. Les gens qui ne croient pas que nous avons le meilleur genre de gouvernement au monde devraient être renvoyés du pays.

1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . 7
Entièrement en désaccord — Entièrement d'accord

16. C'est une mauvaise idée pour des gens de races différentes de s'épouser.

1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . 7
Entièrement en désaccord — Entièrement d'accord

17. La discrimination envers les non-blancs est un problème au Canada.

1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . 7
Entièrement en désaccord — Entièrement d'accord

18. Il est plus difficile pour les non-blancs que pour les autres groupes de réussir dans la société canadienne.

1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . 7
Entièrement en désaccord — Entièrement d'accord

19. Tout le monde devrait avoir une chance égale et la même chance de s'exprimer dans la plupart des choses.

1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . 7
Entièrement en désaccord — Entièrement d'accord

20. Quiconque est disposé et capable de travailler fort, a une bonne chance de réussir.

1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . 7
Entièrement en désaccord — Entièrement d'accord

21. Nous avons besoins de lois solides pour assurer des opportunités d'emploi égales aux non-blancs et autres minorités.

1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . 7
Entièrement en désaccord — Entièrement d'accord

22. Il est acceptable pour un club social de refuser l'adhésion à certaines minorités.

1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . 7
Entièrement en désaccord — Entièrement d'accord

23. Si les employeurs ne veulent embaucher que certains groupes de personnes, c'est de leurs affaires.

1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . 7
Entièrement en désaccord — Entièrement d'accord

24. **Les employeurs devraient réserver un certain nombre de places pour embaucher du personnel qualifié de non-blancs et d'autres minorités.**

1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . 7
Entièrement en désaccord — **Entièrement d'accord**

25. **Le gouvernement devrait refuser de donner des contrats à des compagnies qui n'ont pas une proportion acceptable de minorités raciales et ethno-culturelles.**

1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . 7
Entièrement en désaccord — **Entièrement d'accord**

26. Le gouvernement devrait montrer l'exemple et embaucher plus de personnes des minorités ethniques.

1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . 7
Entièrement en désaccord — **Entièrement d'accord**

27. Les gens devraient réussir d'eux-même, et ne pas blâmer leurs origines ethno-culturelles ou raciales pour leurs problèmes.

1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5 . . 6 . . 7
Entièrement en désaccord — **Entièrement d'accord**

CULTURAL SECURITY

	Total	City							Group Membership				
		Vanc.	Calgary	Wpg.	Toronto	Montreal	Halifax	St. John's	Pro	Anti	Diff.	Y. Female	Y. Male
1. If more immigrants from various backgrounds come to Canada, then Canadians would lose their identity	2.37	2.41	2.76	2.05	2.89	2.57	2.00	1.50	**2.01**	**2.87**	**.86**	1.93	2.29
2. Canadian children growing up surrounded by people of different ethnic backgrounds will be left without a solid cultural base	2.59	2.50	2.76	2.05	3.26	2.38	3.00	2.02	**2.45**	**2.96**	**.47**	2.11	2.43
3. People can feel secure when they are with others of different ethnic backgrounds	5.26	5.50	5.10	5.20	5.11	5.45	5.55	5.10	**5.45**	**5.04**	**.41**	5.57	5.11
4. There is no reason to worry about the survival of one's own cultural group	4.24	4.45	4.67	4.20	4.56	4.21	5.15	3.07	**4.12**	**4.51**	**.39**	3.82	4.11

ECONOMIC SECURITY

	Total	City							Group Membership				
		Vanc.	Calgary	Wpg.	Toronto	Montreal	Halifax	St. John's	Pro	Anti	Diff.	Y. Female	Y. Male
1. Welfare costs are higher because there are so many different ethnic groups in Canada.	2.45	2.45	2.14	1.90	3.00	2.77	1.95	1.93	2.03	2.71	.68	2.46	2.89
2. Having groups of different ethnic backgrounds in Canada gives us an important advantage in international trade	5.21	5.55	5.43	5.25	5.12	5.36	5.35	4.79	5.33	5.28	.05	4.96	4.89

PREJUDICE/RACISM

	Total	City							Group Membership				
		Vanc.	Calgary	Wpg.	Toronto	Montreal	Halifax	St. John's	Pro	Anti	Diff.	Y. Female	Y. Male
1. Discrimination against non-whites is a problem in Canada	4.63	5.41	4.76	4.25	4.37	4.75	4.68	4.51	5.15	4.03	1.12	4.43	5.18
2. The worst danger to real Canadianism during the last 50 years has come from foreign ideas and agitators	1.94	2.00	2.10	1.78	1.98	2.00	1.58	1.93	1.55	2.25	.70	1.93	2.11
3. It is a bad idea for people of different races to marry one another	1.90	2.00	1.33	2.05	1.98	2.04	1.95	1.73	1.63	2.26	.63	1.50	1.96
4. Foreigners are all right in their place, but they carry it too far when they get too familiar with us	1.86	1.86	2.30	1.84	1.95	2.13	1.21	1.46	1.64	2.22	.58	1.46	1.75
5. People who do not believe that we have the best kind of government in the world should be made to leave the country	1.81	1.82	1.81	1.50	1.77	2.25	1.79	1.39	1.64	2.07	.43	1.75	1.54

MULTICULTURAL IDEOLOGY

	Total	City							Group Membership				
		Vanc.	Calgary	Wpg.	Toronto	Montreal	Halifax	St. John's	Pro	Anti	Diff.	Y. Female	Y. Male
1. The unity of this country is weakened by Canadians of different origins sticking to their old ways	3.42	3.73	3.43	3.37	3.72	3.30	2.65	3.40	2.56	4.13	1.57	3.25	3.96
2. If Canadians of different origins want to keep their own culture, they should keep it to themselves, and not bother other people in this country	3.26	3.05	3.43	3.84	3.53	3.20	3.16	2.76	2.69	4.12	1.43	2.50	2.93
3. Canadians should do more to learn about the customs and heritage of ethnic groups in this country	5.39	5.50	5.24	5.53	5.02	5.27	5.75	5.86	5.83	4.89	.94	5.46	5.61
4. It is best for Canada if all people who come to this country forget their cultural background as soon as possible	2.14	2.23	2.00	1.75	2.30	2.88	1.50	1.48	1.71	2.61	.90	2.11	2.00
5. A society that has a variety of ethnic groups is more able to tackle new problems as they occur	5.08	5.18	5.43	6.05	4.55	4.93	5.40	5.12	5.51	4.90	.61	4.46	4.89
6. Canada will be a better place when we have full and equal partnership among all groups making up Canadian society	6.03	5.91	5.90	6.40	5.89	5.98	6.05	6.21	6.27	5.84	.43	6.18	5.75

HUMAN RIGHTS ATTITUDES AND VALUES

	Total	City							Group Membership				
		Vanc.	Calgary	Wpg.	Toronto	Montreal	Halifax	St. John's	Pro	Anti	Diff.	Y. Female	Y. Male
1. The government should set an example and hire more people from ethnic minorities	4.96	5.14	4.90	4.90	4.54	5.30	4.60	5.20	5.40	4.54	.86	4.93	4.93
2. If employers want to hire only certain groups of people, that's their business	2.48	2.91	1.81	2.25	2.56	2.46	3.30	2.20	2.08	2.79	.71	2.29	2.89
3. The government should refuse to give contracts to companies that do not have a fair proportion of racial and ethnic minorities	4.17	4.41	4.10	4.58	4.07	3.91	3.85	4.56	4.66	3.96	.70	4.11	3.46
4. Employers should set aside a certain number of places to hire qualified blacks and other minorities	3.51	3.57	2.80	3.47	3.14	4.14	3.42	3.51	3.81	3.14	.67	4.11	3.18
5. People should make it on their own, and not blame their ethnic or racial background for their problems	5.46	4.95	5.62	5.90	5.75	5.54	5.45	4.95	5.13	5.76	.63	5.50	5.50
6. It is more difficult for non-whites to be successful in Canadian society than it is for other groups	4.19	4.55	3.81	4.15	3.80	4.30	4.00	4.66	4.44	3.81	.63	4.32	4.46

Cont'd...

...cont'd

	Total	City							Group Membership				
		Vanc.	Calgary	Wpg.	Toronto	Montreal	Halifax	St. John's	Pro	Anti	Diff.	Y. Female	Y. Male
7. We need strong laws that guarantee equal job opportunities for blacks and other minorities	5.69	5.55	5.71	5.37	5.25	5.84	5.40	6.44	5.91	5.41	.50	5.68	5.89
8. It is alright for a social club to bar certain minorities from membership	1.94	2.18	1.18	1.95	2.44	1.93	1.50	1.44	1.77	2.19	.42	1.50	2.14
9. Anyone who is willing and able to work hard has a good chance of succeeding	6.02	5.45	6.05	6.20	5.93	6.26	6.15	5.95	5.64	6.40	.40	6.00	6.00
10. Everyone should have an equal chance and an equal say in most things	6.60	6.45	6.33	6.70	6.54	6.71	6.65	6.66	6.61	6.61	.00	6.71	6.43

APPENDIX V

-Moderator's Guide-

Moderator's Guide

This is a preliminary draft of the focus group moderator's guide meant for discussion purposes only.

1.0 General Introduction (approx. 5 min.)

- Explanation of focus group techniques
- Individual opinions are important
- Encouragement of all people to comment
- Confidentiality of all information and respondents' identity
- Taping and observing
- Explanation of questionnaire to be followed by group discussion
- Introduction of moderator and participants

2.0 Paper/Pencil Test (approx. 20-25 min.)

The purpose of the paper and pencil test is to provide preliminary quantitative information for screening out the least discriminating questions in the proposed values batteries.

3.0 Warm Up Discussion (approx. 30 min.)

The purpose is to warm up participants and explore general views of the Canadian ethno-cultural mosaic and common Canadian values. [NOTE TO MODERATOR: DO NOT MENTION MULTICULTURALISM; SPONTANEOUS MENTION IS TO BE NOTED AND EXPLORED]

3.1 What Values do Canadians share?

Probe for:

- What are the values most Canadians hold in common?
- What values do you personally share with other Canadians?
- Accepting of different ethno-cultural groups **[NOTE TO MODERATOR: WAIT FOR SPONTANEOUS MENTION; DON'T EXPLORE UNLESS VOLUNTEERED]**

3.2 Now I'm going to read you a quote I'd like to hear your reaction to: "One of the things that makes Canada a great country to live in is the degree of tolerance and the appreciation that most people have for people from different cultures and values".

[NOTE TO MODERATOR: FOR ALL MENTIONS OF TOLERANCE/IN-TOLERANCE, EXPLORE THE LIMITS TO TOLERANCE AND WHY]

Probe for:

- Ethno-cultural or racial groups that are/are not discriminated against - Which? Why? Why not?
- English v.s. French Canadian values that do/do not clash - Which? Why? Why not?

3.3 Being Canadian (exploring the "we"/"they" concept)

Probe for:

- Are there groups that you see as being more Canadian, or, less Canadian?
- Are there certain groups that are less loyal to Canada?
- What does "loyal to Canada" mean?
- Explore cross-pressures (i.e. Jewish Canadians loyal to Israel, Polish Canadians loyal to Poland, English Canadians loyal to England, Ukrainian Canadians loyal to Ukraine, Iraqi Canadians loyal to Iraq)
- When does someone become "Canadian", what does it take?
- QUEBEC ONLY:
  - what does the term "allophone" mean?
  - who are the allophones?
  - can people who speak mostly French be allophones?
  - at what point does an allophone become "Quebecois"?
  - is this possible?
  - at what point does a visible minority become "quebecois"

4.0 General Discussion of Multiculturalism

The purpose of this section is to formally introduce multiculturalism to discussion and explore it at, "top-of-mind" level.

4.1 What does the term "multiculturalism" mean to you?

Probe for:

- Describe it in your own words.
- Some people say Canadians should be more homogeneous/follow the status quo - what are your thoughts?
- Other people say Canadians should be more respectful and protective of its ethno-cultural mix - what are your thoughts?

[NOTE TO MODERATOR: AGAIN LOOK FOR THE LIMITS TO TOLERANCE AND WHY AND ON WHAT ISSUES]

4.2 Have you heard of the federal government's multiculturalism policy?

Probe for:

- If "yes", what does it entail?
- If "no", is this something you as a Canadian should be made aware of? Why/why not?
- What sort of policy should we have?

4.3 Mission Statement [MODERATOR TO READ PRIOR TO DISCUSSION]

[NOTE TO MODERATOR: THROUGHOUT ALL PROBES, BE SURE TO BRING OUT CULTURAL, SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CONTRIBUTIONS/BLOCKS AND LIMITS PERTAINING TO THE ASPECTS PUT FORTH BY THE PARTICIPANTS - ie. WHAT ARE THE LIMITS TO DIVERSITY?]

Probe for:

- Do you support/oppose federal multiculturalism policy? (why?)
- If oppose, what is major problem and how would you change policy?
- If support, why?
- What are some of the strengths and weaknesses of multiculturalism policy?
- Does multiculturalism policy unite/divide Canada? Why/why not?
- Should the federal government be providing leadership on multiculturalism, or should they stay out of it? Why?
- Should any other level of government provide leadership? Why? Why not?
- Outside of governments, who should play lead/support roles? Why?

5.0 Specific Multiculturalism Policies

This discussion will be used to explore the acceptability of various multiculturalism initiatives, and whether they are seen to contribute to building a stronger Canada.

5.1 Have you heard about the new Department of Multiculturalism and Citizenship?

Probe for:

- Good/bad idea to have a government department that focuses exclusively on this issue?
- Why?

5.2 Have you heard about the Canadian Race Relations Foundation?

[NOTE TO MODERATOR: ARMS LENGTH FROM GOVERNMENT, PAID FOR WITH TAX DOLLARS. ADVISES GOVERNMENT AND CANADIANS ABOUT HOW TO ELIMINATE RACISM AND ALL FORMS OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN OUR SOCIETY.]

Probe for:

- Worthwhile, good/bad idea?
- Why?

5.3 Have you heard about the Canadian Heritage Languages Institute?

[NOTE TO MODERATOR: INSTITUTE ENCOURAGES THE ACQUISITION, RETENTION, AND USE OF HERITAGE LANGUAGES, OTHER THAN ENGLISH OR FRENCH, IN CANADA.]

Probe for:

- Good/bad idea?
- Should the federal government be doing this?
- Why?

5.4 Race Relations and Cross-Cultural Understanding

[NOTE TO MODERATOR: FOR ALL INITIATIVES NOTED BELOW, PROBE: HAVE YOU HEARD ABOUT THIS, IS THIS GOOD/BAD IDEA? SHOULD THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT BE DOING THIS? WHY? WHY NOT?]

- Provide research, information, and public education on how to eliminate discrimination and racism.
- Promote institutional change in policy, health, education and other Canadian institutions.
- Assist voluntary groups of Canadians, organized to draw attention to changes needed in Canadian institutions.

5.5 Heritage Cultures and Languages

- Assist publishing, performing and visual arts, scholarly research, grants/provide contracts/contributions.

5.6 Community Support and Participation

Programs to help ethnocultural groups maintain a sense of community. This is done by:

- Providing leadership and volunteer training, youth programs.
- Identifying and presenting community concerns to decision-makers (helping groups to lobby government).
- Support non-profit, voluntary organizations in the community:
    - to held those born in other countries to acquire the skills and knowledge to participate as full citizens
    - to promote action on the needs of those born in other countries, particularly immigrant and visible minority women.

6.0 Communications

This section will be used to probe the desire for communications on specific multiculturalism policies, and preferences in terms of communications vehicles.

6.1 Preferences for Communication Vehicles

Probe for:

- Desire for information on specific programs (top-of-mind)
- What do you need to know?
- How do you want to be informed?

7.0 Conclusion

This section provides a post-test for the "ballot questions" following detailed discussion.

7.1 Once more around table to ask support/oppose multiculturalism policy. Ask anyone who changed their mind from start of group why change?

7.2 Once more around table to ask whether multiculturalism unites/divides Canada. Ask anyone who changed their mind from start of group why change?

7.3 If you could recommend one thing to the Minister responsible for Multiculturalism, what would that be?

8.0 Thank and terminate/remuneration for participating.